

nate rest favour the copious secretion. We find, however, that the udder of the mare is similarly distended, and frequently discharges itself in the same manner, either whilst travelling on the road, or in harness on the farm—and if we seek for the highest authority; we find in the human species, that the labouring mothers among the poor are generally the most abundant nurses, and have the healthiest and the hardest children. There is no reason to suppose that moderate work would lessen the quantity of milk in a ratio so great, as to make it a loss compared with the gain, that would be derived from the labour of the cow. Generous feed and rest have hitherto been attended with copious flows of milk, but it remains to be proved whether the exercise of moderate labour, by acting as a stimulant to the system generally, would not excite a healthy and increased action in the vessels secreting the milk. Theory is certainly in favour of it—experience in other animals is not against it, and the experiment in this case is well worth the trial. In answer to the question, whether labour would vitiate the quality of the milk: this would depend upon the amount of labour. If the animal was worried, wearied, and heated the quality of the milk would in all probability be injured; but if we can judge from the growth and health of the young of animals that are worked in moderation, and from the plump and ruddy faces of the children of the industrious poor, the argument will be in favor of moderate exercise.

If the moderate working of cows does not injure them as milchers; every farmer would be a gainer by the employment of them. But their labour would be particularly beneficial to the poor man. And I have no hesitation in saying, that the gain in labour, would amply compensate him for the trifling loss he might sustain from the diminished quantity of milk, even if such a diminution should follow as a consequence. Let us suppose, what I really believe to be the truth of the case, that there are no other objections, than those of prejudice and usage, against the propriety and advantage of using "cows in draught," and let us now enquire, what would be the gain? Those who have even a slight acquaintance with farming matters in these Provinces, must have witnessed the want of team-strength in spring work, and the disproportionate labour under which the strained and worn-out oxen actually sink in the field. This want is observable on the generality of farms: it is very conspicuous on farms worked by one or two yokes of cattle, and still more so with the cottager, who is himself the creature of burden, whose spade is his plough, and whose back is his hay cart. Now, if we can increase the team-strength without increasing expense we shall materially expedite and ease the labour of our short springs, for it is no uncommon occurrence to lose hours of labour during the feeding of oxen, or the rest of their weak and wearied limbs in the furrow be-

neath the yoke. Light ploughing, harrowing, and drill work might be done with one or two, or more yokes of well fed cows. Light loads of manure might be taken to the field by them. The individual ability of the animals may be small, but their united powers would give an accession of strength to team-work, which would amply reward the farmer for *breaking* in his heifers, and *breaking down* the barrier of prejudice. Many weeks and months of profitable labour might be obtained from cows, both in and out of milk which would more than counterbalance the expense of keeping them through the year. The poor farmer and the cottager are the persons, who would be principally benefitted by the work of these cows. Many of these have no oxen, and they are often compelled to give their own labour for the use of a plough and yoke of oxen, when the field work of the owner is finished, which makes their own planting late, and their crops scanty and doubtful. I certainly agree in sentiment with the writer in the "*New-England Farmer*," and recommend the suggestion to the unprejudiced consideration of experienced farmers. Trial only can furnish a satisfactory reply: and until the trial is fairly made, objections would be unjust. The correct experiment would with three animals as nearly alike as possible from the first breaking in of a pair of heifer yearlings or two year olds: Let their feed be the same, with the exception of a more generous allowance to the working cattle during the working season; and when all are in milk, ascertain the relative quantities of milk and butter, which each furnishes. I am inclined to suspect, that if even the quantity of milk was less, there would not be a similar reduction in the amount of butter obtained from it; as quantity of milk does not always imply a corresponding quantity of butter. Much more might be said in support of the experiment; but I hope the preceding remarks are sufficient to entitle the proposition to the candid consideration of enquiring agriculturists.

COLONUS.

WE have received a communication from Hampton, upon the "*Rotation of Crops*," and thank our correspondent for his useful remarks, but as we have commenced the subject of rotation, and shall enter as fully into the consideration of it as the limits of "*The New Brunswick Agriculturist*" will admit, we must reserve the publication of his letter for some future number.

WE shall devote a large proportion of our next number to *Horticultural matters*.